UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/536,819	05/27/2005	Martin S Wilcox	GB02 0207 US	7960
	7590 05/15/2008 ECTRONICS NORTH AMERICA CORPORATION		EXAMINER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS			NGUYEN, NGA X	
· ·	370 W. TRIMBLE ROAD MS 91/MG SAN JOSE, CA 95131		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3662	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/536,819	WILCOX, MARTIN S		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	NGA X. NGUYEN	3662		
The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by status Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mail earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be to will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDON	N. imely filed in the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
Status				
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06</u> 2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☐ Th     3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allow closed in accordance with the practice under	nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matters, pl			
Disposition of Claims				
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrest is/are allowed. 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and compared application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examination Papers	rawn from consideration.  /or election requirement.  ner.			
10)☑ The drawing(s) filed on 27 May 2005 is/are: a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Seection is required if the drawing(s) is o	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a). bjected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119				
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail I 5)  Notice of Informal 6)  Other:	Date		

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bahl "Radar: An In-Building RF-based User location and Tracking System" in view of Kato, "Development and Evaluation on the Millimeter-Wave Indoor Wireless LAN Demonstrators".

With regard to claim 1-23, Bahl discloses an in-building tracking system:

- Transmitting a ranging signal from one of the base stations and the mobile station to the other and determining relative signal strength of the received ranging signal compared with the transmitted ranging system to determine the position of the mobile and distance between the base station and the mobile station (see section 3.2-4.1.7).

Kato discloses an indoor wireless LAN system:

- A plurality of base stations with an antenna having cosec^2 sensitivity pattern oriented based on an appropriate wire-area coverage that is convenient for the indoor structure (see section II, III & IV). It is inherency of one skill in art to build an indoor structure that has one of the plurality base stations using cosec^2

Application/Control Number: 10/536,819 Page 3

Art Unit: 3662

sensitivity pattern oriented laterally, another with oriented longitudinally, and the other with vertically downwards

A mobile station with quadrant sector beams pyramidal 4-element sequential
array/sector to cover 360 degree in azimuth (see section III). A design choice of
using omnidirectional antenna for the mobile station in an expected way of
implementing of Kato system with no new or unexpected result.

It would have been obvious to modify Bahl by incorporating the teaching of Kato's to have base stations using cosec^2 sensitivity and an Omni-directional antenna for the mobile station so as the indoor positioning system is perform position information accuracy.

## Response to Amendment

2. Applicant's reply to the Office Action on 02/06/2008 has been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claim 1-23, applicant argues that the prior art failed to teach the claims limitation.

Response: The application's arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of the rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to NGA X. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)272-5217. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM-5:00PM.

Application/Control Number: 10/536,819 Page 4

Art Unit: 3662

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, TARCZA H. THOMAS can be reached on (571) 272-6979. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NGA X NGUYEN Examiner Art Unit 3662

NXN

/Thomas H. Tarcza/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3662